



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

✓
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,280	02/18/2005	Rolf Kadel	23177	7776
535	7590	09/06/2007	EXAMINER	
K.F. ROSS P.C. 5683 RIVERDALE AVENUE SUITE 203 BOX 900 BRONX, NY 10471-0900			RODRIGUEZ, JOSEPH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3653	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/525,280	KADEL, ROLF
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joseph C. Rodriguez	3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 February 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/18/05</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

Here, Examiner acknowledges receipt of the International Preliminary Examination Report as well as the International Search Report and the references cited therein.

The references cited in the Search Report have been considered and will be listed on any patent resulting from this application to the extent the references have been provided to the Office and are listed on the accompanying PTO-1449 form. See 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1); MPEP 1893.03(g).

Specification

The disclosure is objected to as lacking appropriate section headings as outlined in 37 CFR 1.77. See also 37 CFR 1.72-1.77; MPEP § 608.01(a). Correction is required.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: "annular frame" (claim 13, ln. 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Here, Applicant failed to provide a written description for the "annular frame" (claim 13, line 6).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Here, Applicant claims an "annular frame" (claim 13, line 6), but teaches a rectangular frame throughout the specification and drawings. This inconsistency between the claims and specification is indefinite. Examiner request clarification and in the interim has interpreted the claims as described in the specification and as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3653

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Christensen et al. ("Christensen") (US 4,122,006).

Christensen (Fig. 1-3, 8) teaches a sieve comprising:

a frame (32); and

a plurality of identical screen assemblies (see multiple decks in fig. 1) removably mounted in the frame and each having a generally horizontal screen,

a frame (20) surrounding the screen, connected to outer edges of the screen, and projecting downward past the screen;

an elongated and longitudinally tensioned element (cable/belt 120; col. 2, ln. 66 et seq. teaching tensioning in transverse direction to motion) having opposite ends anchored in the frame and extending underneath the screen, and

a beater (spheres 122) on the elongated element engageable with a lower face of the respective screen for freeing particles from openings in the screen. Here, the ends of the element are inherently removably secured in the frame.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christensen in view of what is well known in the art.

Christensen as set forth above teaches all that is claimed except for expressly teaching the frame and screen unitarily formed of plastic. Further, under an alternative interpretation, the element may not be regarded as removably secured to the frame or as a belt. The use of integral plastic screens, however, is well known the screening arts for the superior wear qualities of plastic and Examiner takes Official Notice of such. Further, it would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art based on Christensen's teachings to arrived at the claimed invention. That is, Christensen teaches multiple methods of removably securing the element (Fig. 5, 6) and is merely silent on the attachment method in the embodiment shown in figure 8. Further, based on Applicant's teaching of "cable"/"belt", it is not regarded as unreasonable to regard the strand of Christensen as either, and the use of a belt or cable can be regarded—just as removable securing the element—as a mere substitution that would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art. Further, the prior art discussed and cited demonstrates the level of sophistication of one with ordinary skill in the art and that modifications, such as attachment methods and material choices, are well within this skill level. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Christensen for the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

Any references not explicitly discussed above but made of record are considered relevant to the prosecution of the instant application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Joseph C Rodriguez** whose telephone number is **571-272-6942** (M-F, 9 am – 6 pm, EST). The Supervisory Examiner is Patrick Mackey, **571-272-6916**. The **Official** fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

The examiner's **UNOFFICIAL Personal fax number** is **571-273-6942**.

Further, information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.

Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PMR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see
<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>

Should you have questions on access to the Private PMR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (Toll Free).

Signed by Examiner /Joseph Rodriguez/

Jcr

September 3, 2007

